CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

INDIANA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

CD/PV.530
29 August 1989

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 29 August 1989, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. El Ghali Benhima (Morocco)

GE.89-63230/1032B

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): The 530th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is called to order.

Today the Conference continues its consideration of the reports of its ad hoc subsidiary bodies, as well as the consideration and adoption of its annual report to the United Nations General Assembly. However, in conformity with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, any representative who so wishes may raise any matter relevant to the work of the Conference.

On the list of speakers for today I have the representatives of Japan, France (who will speak in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons), China, Mongolia (who will speak in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space), the Republic of Korea, and Mexico (who will speak on behalf of the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament). I now give the floor to the representative of Japan, Ambassador Yamada.

Mr. YAMADA (Japan): Mr. President, I have already had occasion to congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Conference. But I would like to express again my sincere felicitations for your able and skilful leadership. Under your guidance we are close to the successful conclusion of this year's session of the Conference.

As this will be my last intervention as the Japanese representative in the Conference, I would like to share with you what I think about the Conference and multilateral disarmament diplomacy. When I came to join you in the fall of 1986, the world was witnessing the beginning of a turn in the history of disarmament and arms control. In East-West relations, and in particular in relations between the United States and the USSR, things are happening one after another which, in the preceding years, we could not even dream of. The INF agreement and its smooth implementation, the joint verification experiments at the United States and USSR nuclear testing sites, the commencement of the CFE talks and their rapid progress, and the inviting of visitors to sensitive military facilities, are some of those which I have in mind.

I came here with the hope that, after a long period of hibernation, we were to see significant movements in the multilateral disarmament process. I was delighted to see the sincerity, devotion and hard work of the members of the Conference for the cause of disarmament. I have experienced ups and downs, expectations and disappointments. I must be candid and say that I leave here with the feeling that the curtain has not yet risen on the scene of multilateral disarmament. However I detect some underlying trends clearly in motion. The attention of the world public is focused more and more on the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament. Progress in disarmament does not come easily. Success demands persistence, hard work and the demonstration of inspired political leadership. I am convinced that the time will soon come, and must come, when your efforts bear fruit.

The issues related to nuclear weapons are of high priority for the people of Japan, who ardently pray that nuclear weapons will ultimately be eliminated so that the nuclear holocaust is never repeated. Japan strives for the

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

realization of a comprehensive nuclear test ban. International efforts for a nuclear test ban have a long history of more than 30 years. There have been times when strenuous and concerted efforts were made and agreement looked imminent. I must confess my disappointment when I hear statements which, in my view, inadvertently neglect the history of international efforts, contradict the commitment in existing legal documents and cast doubt on their credibility and good faith.

The nuclear test ban is an independent disarmament measure. It is designed to stop the horizontal spread of nuclear weapons. It is designed to put constraints on the further development of nuclear weapons. The proponents of nuclear testing say it is necessary to test as long as we depend on nuclear weapons. Yes, they are right. That is precisely the reason I want the nuclear test ban. Some say that the nuclear test ban will have little effect on nuclear armament. They may also be right. But then for what purpose do they continue testing? Though Japan would like as much to see the immediate cessation of all nuclear tests, we do not advocate an unrealistic approach, nor any measure which adversely affects the security of the world, in particular that of Western countries, with which Japan shares the same political values. That is why my Foreign Minister proposed in the Conference in 1984 the step-by-step approach. That is why Japan supports the United States-USSR agreement on full-scale, stage-by-stage negotiations, embodied in their joint statement of 17 September 1987. We sincerely hope that the two Governments will accelerate the implementation of their agreement and that the multilateral negotiation process will soon be linked to their undertaking.

The Conference on Disarmament has been prevented for several years past from conducting practical work on the nuclear test ban issue over the question of a mandate for the establishment of an ad hoc committee on agenda item 1, "Nuclear test ban". The deadlock was caused by the conflicting formal positions of the groups. However, I have witnessed a growing number of delegations expressing their individual wishes to start substantive work on nuclear testing issues in the Conference. When I took up the presidency of the Conference in March, I embarked on a process of dialogue in search of consensus on the question of a mandate. In an effort to disentangle ourselves from the impasse of the conflicting group positions, I consulted each delegation on an informal and individual basis. With the co-operation of all the delegations, I was able to establish that the draft mandate proposed by Ambassador Vejvoda in CD/863 could in fact be used as a basis to develop a consensus, and I believe this represents a breakthrough. Further consultations have narrowed down the difference considerably, and I see a ray of hope for agreement.

I am very grateful to you, Mr. President, for your constant encouragement of my efforts. I would also like to express my gratitude to the successive presidents and many delegates who have rendered their warm support to this undertaking. I would also like to note that Ambassador de Azambuja and Ambassador Dietze have given me valuable co-operation as item co-ordinators for their groups. I regret that I am as yet not in a position to report agreement to you. It is all my fault and not that of any delegation. I am

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

confident, however, that with continued efforts during the inter-sessional period, we still have a good chance to agree to start the substantive work at the outset of the session next year.

I would like to comment briefly on the progress report on the twenty-eighth session of the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events, contained in document CD/944. I highly appreciate the continued excellent work carried out by the Group to finalize the design of a modern international seismic data exchange system. The GSE is now at a very important stage of its work in putting its conceptual design to the test. In this connection, I note with great satisfaction that the first phase of the Group's second large-scale technical test (GSETT-2) will be completed by the end of this year, and that its second phase will start on 16 January next year.

At the same time, I share the serious concern expressed by Dr. Dahlman, Chairman of the Group, concerning participation in GSETT-2. The geographical distribution of the 41 stations offered by 21 countries is uneven, with no station in Africa nor in South America, and only a few in Asia. Broader participation is called for, in order to meet the objectives of GSETT-2.

A global seismic monitoring system is an essential factor in a future CTB. The value of the GSE's contribution would also be enhanced by wider participation. I would like to call on those countries which have not yet done so, especially those in the southern hemisphere, to join the GSE.

The preparatory process for the last review of the NPT next year has already started. The first session of the Preparatory Committee, held in May, was attended by 95 States, 30 more than the preparatory meeting for the third review - an indication of growing interest and concern on the future of the NPT régime after 1995. For the last 20 years the NPT régime has been one of the most important legal frameworks for the security of the world. Japan's objective is to safeguard and strengthen the NPT régime. For that, we need strenuous efforts on the part of both nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States. We need to consider the issues of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, nuclear disarmament and a nuclear test ban in their interrelationship, and formulate a coherent multilateral strategy. The NPT is not an end in itself, it is an intermediate step towards a nuclear-free world. In order to maintain the NPT régime, there must be parallel genuine efforts in nuclear disarmament. We welcome the ongoing negotiations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on START, and would like to express our sincere hope for the early success of their negotiations. I would also like to call upon other nuclear-weapon States, as well as non-nuclear-weapon States at the threshold, to consider the policy of foresight for future generations. After all, what right does a country have to claim to be different from others on nuclear choice? If the others follow their course, then chaos and a catastrophe on our planet will ensue.

The success of the Paris Conference on the prohibition of chemical weapons at the outset of the year provided the momentum for the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons to conduct intensified negotiations and achieve many important results, particularly on technical issues. They are

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

indispensable elements for drafting the chemical weapons convention. I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Ambassador Pierre Morel, Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, for his untiring efforts, wisdom and leadership. I would also like to commend the chairmen of the five working groups for their excellent work.

We have not, however, had a breakthrough on important political issues - for instance, how to reach a common basic understanding on verification régimes including challenge inspection, the composition and decision-making of the Executive Council and undiminished security during the transition period. We must take into account the interrelated nature of those issues and others within the overall framework of the Convention.

The Paris Conference generated a global political momentum for the CW negotiations. But looking back over what took place in the Conference this year, I have a sense of uneasiness that the momentum might be slipping out of our fingers. Setting an artificial deadline for the negotiation is of course not necessarily conducive to a good treaty. On the other hand, can we just go on and on, business as usual, and get a treaty on issues like chemical weapons of such political magnitude? I am not sure if it will work. We must have a common perception of the political target of the time frame of the negotiation. We must have political determination to work with that political time frame in mind, if we are to have a CW Convention.

The Government of Australia will host the Government-Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons in three weeks' time. Japan will participate in the conference and work for its success. We hope the conference will give further impetus to the CW negotiations here. I am grateful to Ambassador David Reese for clarifying the character of the conference in response to the joint statement of the Group of 21. Japan is gravely concerned at the growing danger of the spread of chemical weapons. In this respect, Japan is taking, individually and in concert with like-minded governments, appropriate measures in conformity with paragraph 4 of the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference. On the other hand, our global efforts must be concentrated on the comprehensive prohibition of chemical weapons, and not on any intermediate measures.

Verification problems are very difficult, both politically and technically. While it may be impossible to establish a watertight verification régime, we should strive for the setting up of a verification régime which is reasonably effective and reliable. It is also important to take note of the basic differences between the verification of CW destruction, which is conducted for 10 years, and the verification of "non-production", which lasts for ever.

Working Group 1 has worked out the "Annex on the protection of confidential information". It is indispensable to protect the confidentiality of both military and civil information in a proper way. For that, I believe, this annex is an important product. The Group has also addressed the "Protocol on inspection procedures", verification régimes under article VI and

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

others. We find it important to discuss details of those issues in order to solve verification problems and draft a consistent text. It is hoped that the chairmen's laudable initiatives will bring about further progress.

The national trial inspections have been very useful in drafting a realistic convention and raising awareness of the convention among those concerned in capitals. As a follow-on to the report on its trial inspection, Japan has already submitted a working paper on initial visits and "step-by-step inspections". Based on the results of national trial inspections, the Ad hoc Committee should continue to follow up this useful exercise in appropriate ways.

The "pattern of verification" is an issue of basic importance to the CW convention. If we go into detailed discussions with no common understanding on a basic framework of verification, we may well be faced with more confusion. In this context, I very much appreciate Ambassador Morel's serious efforts in trying to find some common understanding on challenge inspection.

Working Group 4 has worked steadily since the spring session so as to compile the annex on chemicals. When we discuss the schedules and guidelines under article VI, we should strike a proper balance between the risk to the purposes of the convention and the necessity to make effective and efficient use of the limited resources of the technical secretariat. Though it is easily forgotten in detailed discussions, we also need to note the basic difference between schedule 1 chemicals, which are in principle banned, and those in schedules 2 and 3, which are permitted for production, consumption, etc., under appropriate controls. We still find it necessary to continue detailed study with respect to specific problems. But I greatly appreciate the chairmen's initiatives based upon technical and expert knowledge, which have enabled the Committee to make important progress in the areas under study by the Group, including the annex on chemicals.

I would also like to add that, thanks to the serious efforts of the chairmen, we were also able to deepen our discussions and produce some tangible results in other working groups. To name a few, my delegation thinks that important work has been done with respect to amendment sanctions and others in Group 2, article VIII, article VII and others in Group 3, and article X, the preparation period and others in Group 5.

As was emphasized in the Declaration of the Paris Conference, it is imperative that the CW Convention should be global. We heartily welcome the increased participation in the CW negotiations by States not members of the Conference. As we agreed in Paris, any State wishing to contribute to the negotiations should be able to do so.

Briefly on the issues relating to preventing an arms race in outer space: We acknowledge the special responsibility of the two major space Powers in this field. Progress in their bilateral negotiations has a critical impact on our discussions in the Conference. And we wish for early progress in their negotiations in Geneva. At the same time, we should proceed with our work of examining what multilateral agreements would be useful. Our work must be on the basis of three elements: that outer space does not belong to any

(Mr. Yamada, Japan)

country; that an arms race in outer space directly affects the security of not just the two major Powers but all other countries as well; and that rapid progress in space development is being made by countries other than the United States and the USSR.

What approach should we take in the Conference? We must know exactly how outer space is being used in practice, and examine the existing legal régime to see how it can be utilized to prevent an arms race in outer space. This approach requires discussion on how to deal with gaps between current outer space activities and the existing international legal régime, as well as on how to enhance the existing legal régime in order to prevent an arms race in outer space. It is essential to have a common interpretation in order to implement the existing legal régime. But there does not exist consensus on interpretation of these legal provisions. Steps must be taken to try to arrive at agreement on the definition of terms, taking into account recent scientific and technological advances. In this regard, I commend the analysis of terminological problems presented to the outer space Committee by Canada last year.

The Conference could play an important role in formulating confidence-building measures in outer space. In coming years, as outer space becomes increasingly crowded with space objects of various types, there will be a need to evolve "traffic rules" so as to avoid accidents. The concept of "rules of the road" in outer space might be a subject which the Conference could develop. In this regard, the presentation made by the scientific experts of the Federal Republic of Germany and France during the summer session was very useful.

Current space-based reconnaissance involves the use of several types of satellites. Scientific and technological advances make it possible to monitor military manoeuvres and military equipment. Satellite observations provide a major tool for verification, and may also be used to provide data complementary to the evidence obtained by other means of verification of disarmament agreements. Satellite verification is also a subject which the Conference might tackle from various angles.

I will be bidding farewell to you to take up my new assignment in the Arab Republic of Egypt, the greatest country of ancient culture and modern dynamism, which Ambassador Nabil Elaraby so ably represents here in the Conference. My successor, Ambassador Mitsuro Donowaki, will join you soon. He is an outstanding diplomat the Japanese foreign service is proud of. May I request you to accord him the same close co-operation you have been kind enough to extend to me?

Mr. President, distinguished colleagues, Ambassador Komatina, Ambassador Berasategui, members of the Department of Disarmament Affairs, interpreters and all the members of the secretariat: My wife, who is attending the plenary today in the upper gallery in conformity with rule 20 of the rules of procedure, and myself would like to express our deepest gratitude to you all for your kindness in making our stay in Geneva most fruitful and memorable. We will treasure for ever the pleasant memories of our association with you. We now wish you every success in your noble task for the cause of multilateral disarmament.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Japan for his statement, and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. Ambassador Yamada is leaving us after two years and a half in the Conference, and will leave a remarkable memory behind him owing to his personal and professional qualities. With his special kindness and exceptional style and diplomatic skill, he has played an important role in the Conference, notably recently in seeking a convergence of positions on very delicate issues, either as President or as representative of his country, Japan, which he has represented in the Conference with great distinction. Recently we have witnessed the efforts he has made to conduct the informal consultations aimed at the re-establishment of the ad hoc committee on agenda item 1, "Nuclear test ban", and we are very grateful to him. Ambassador Yamada has brought us closer to consensus on this topic, and I am sure that his contribution to the Conference will have a positive outcome. Ambassador and Mrs. Yamada have our best wishes in his new and very important diplomatic duties. I now give the floor to the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, Ambassador Morel, to introduce the report of the Ad hoc Committee, which has been issued under the symbol CD/952.

Mr. MOREL (France) (translated from French): First of all, Mr President, let me say how delighted the French delegation is at seeing you presiding over our Conference during the month of August: not only because of the excellent relations which have traditionally linked our two countries, but also because we have all appreciated the skill and the competence with which you have guided our work through this delicate period which, as is the case every year, is the time when we finalize the report of the Conference. May I also congratulate Ambassador Bayart of Mongolia for the talent with which he occupied the Chair in July? Let me also say how greatly we have benefited over the last few years from the experience of Ambassador van Schaik of the Netherlands and Ambassador Yamada of Japan. We wish them every success in their new posts, which fortunately will not completely take them outside our disarmament community. Finally I would like to bid a welcome to Ambassadors Rasaputram of Sri Lanka and Ogada of Kenya.

The time has come to introduce to you the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, reference CD/952, which the Committee adopted on Friday, 18 August. It contains the three well-known elements: the technical section; appendix I, which is the "rolling text" proper; and appendix II, which serves as a basis for future work. Here I would like to draw your attention to a typographical error in the French version of the report. In the table of contents for appendix II, the fourth line from the bottom on page 15 should read "Articles XII, XIV et XX de la structure préliminaire...". In the same way, the heading on page 215 should read "Articles XII, XIV et XX de la structure préliminaire...". The secretariat has informed me that a corrigendum will be distributed to put this right.

Before I take you quickly through the main results achieved by the Committee since last February, I would like to start by making a few general comments. Firstly, we have done an enormous amount of work. I am well aware that the result we are all looking for is not a question of quantity but of quality, and if the Committee, together with its subsidiary bodies, organized 209 meetings in all, the idea was to make as much progress as possible towards the completion of the convention banning chemical weapons, in accordance with

(Mr. Morel, France)

the strong and clear call made in the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference on the prohibition of chemical weapons. All delegations, those of the member countries of the Conference as well as those of the non-member countries - of which we have twice as many as last year - redoubled their efforts, and I take this opportunity to thank them for their readiness to work, their contributions and their encouragement.

The second comment is that as a result of this sustained work, the report I am introducing today provides you with a markedly improved draft convention. The thematic approach adopted this year by the Committee made it possible to cover all the aspects of the convention, to link them together and to put them in better order, the result being that today we have a more complete, more coherent and more methodical text. Does this mean - and here I come to my third point - that we are close to our goal? It may be tempting to note that the negotiations did not enable us to achieve the necessary "breakthrough" during this session, that the "point of no return was not reached", or that we dwelt too long on technical considerations rather than devising the "political package" which is essential for concluding our task. I am the first to regret that it was not possible to go even further, but at the same time I believe that the clichés to which I have just referred do not really give a true picture of the real state of affairs in the negotiations. The more we redouble our efforts, the more clearly we can see that we can only progress if there is a proper combination of political initiatives and technical improvements, both of which are essential and inseparable. The chemical weapons convention will be an extremely complicated document which will have to have solid scientific, technical and industrial foundations, while at the same time setting down unprecedented rules for security.

How in this light can we describe the work done by the Committee during the recent session? It seems to me that the bulk of the technical infrastructure of the convention is now in place, and that the substantial political headway we have recorded this year make it possible to properly define the general régime of the future convention.

After these opening comments, I would now like to describe briefly the principal results in terms of the five main subject categories which were covered by the five working groups. On the subject of verification in all its forms, we had a particularly heavy agenda. First of all I should mention the insertion of an annex on confidentiality in appendix I, which at a stroke allows us to deal substantively with a question which, even a year ago, was more often than not referred as "to be discussed". This document makes it possible to lighten the body of the convention and at the same time to meet the present and future concerns of Governments and enterprises, but also those of the technical secretariat. In the same way, Group 1 made progress on inspection procedures, and should be able, before the beginning of the next session, to complete the conversion of the directives for the international inspectorate, which are still contained in appendix I, into a protocol on inspection procedures which for the time being is contained in appendix II, which will give a more precise and more complete definition of the working conditions for the future inspectors.

(Mr. Morel, France)

I would also mention that this year the Committee continued a large-scale exercise which was started last year, namely the launching of national trial inspections and the consideration of national reports. This work, which was first conducted under Ambassador Hyltenius of Sweden, whom I would like to thank for his personal contribution, was the subject of an informal exchange of views with experts from industry at the end of June and was then pursued, as agreed, under the Chairman of Group 1. Thanks to this initial multifaceted work in the field, in conditions as close as possible to reality, the Committee was able to confirm the practicability of the provisions of article VI and make various improvements in the convention. This is already the case with the new version of the model agreement for facilities handling schedule 2 chemicals. Many more lessons can be drawn from these trial inspections, which should continue on a broader scale and be organized by other countries. I would finally add here that the Committee directly tackled one of the most sensitive issues in the future convention, namely challenge inspection. Intensive consultations conducted by the Chair made it possible to identify in a precise way those essential elements which will have to be contained in article IX, part 2, which, as everybody acknowledges, will be as it were the key stone of the general system of verification under of the convention.

Legal questions may be better defined, but are no less difficult to deal with. Appendix I now contains a series of final clauses; these are articles XV to XIX, which derive from the consultations conducted last year, together, in appendix II, with the results of the work done on the delicate issue of amendments, and elements to be taken up on relationships with other international agreements, duration and withdrawal, languages, depositaries and registration. The group also dealt with the very important question of sanctions, which had never been dealt with as such, and is of interest to a great number of delegations. The document which appears at the end of appendix II provides a good basis for further work on this subject.

The work of Group 3, on institutional matters, made it possible to update articles VII and VIII of the convention and thus to confirm the tripartite framework under the future convention, that is to say the Conference of the States Parties, the Executive Council and the technical secretariat. The same can be said for the document on the preparatory commission, which will have the task of establishing the future organization after signature and before entry into force. Going beyond the actual text, national trial inspections also made it possible to highlight the precise role to be played by the national authority which will be set up in each country to institute and maintain liaison with the technical secretariat. In the same way, the Ad hoc Committee started to examine very specifically, with the assistance of experts, the question of the costs and the staffing of the future organization.

Group 3 also started studying the question of the scientific advisory board, which might provide the Director-General, and where necessary the other organs of the convention, with an independent opinion on rapidly evolving areas. Consultations conducted by the group, and then by the Chairman of the Committee, also made it possible to establish a hypothetical working framework on the composition and decision-making procedures of the Executive Council. There is no need to stress that these issues, which for a long time were left on one side, are of great political importance. Agreement will no doubt only be reached towards the end of the negotiations; but to arrive stage by stage

(Mr. Morel, France)

at an agreed formula, we must first of all have specific elements to think about which will allow each delegation to clarify its position: this is the aim of the document contained in appendix II.

Turning to Group 4, it must be recognized that the "chemical annex" marks major progress. To go back to the general comment I made just now, this may be said to be a very technical issue, and thus one of secondary interest. But how can we not see that, particularly with schedules 1, 2 and 3, this annex contains the matrix of the general régime of the convention? The schedules are now clearly established, and closely tied in with specific declaration, monitoring and verification régimes. Going beyond the resulting technical improvements, regroupings, reordering and clarifications for the whole of the text, I would like to stress more broadly that this new annex strengthens the whole edifice of the convention. A year ago, at the same date, we were wondering about whether we ought to have three or four schedules because of the persistent difficulties related to the question of super-toxic lethal chemicals. The whole technical infrastructure of the convention was thus shaky. The question has been examined in depth, in all its complexity, with the valuable assistance of experts. I believe that all delegations today agree that a solution can be found in the context of the three régimes and the three schedules with the appropriate categories, giving prime attention to the revision of the schedules and thus to the identification of new products.

At the same time the group was able to substantially revise annex 1 to article VI and thus to reach agreement on the particular conditions for the very limited production of prohibited substances for research, medical, pharmaceutical and protection purposes. Work will have to be continued on this annex.

I now come to the fifth and last group, dealing with the transition, a theme which made it possible to look at the convention in a continuum of development, starting from the current negotiations and working up to the definitive régime at the end of the 10-year transitional period. Appendix II thus contains elements concerning the preparatory period, in particular relating to possible measures for co-operation even before entry into force, the role of the organization after entry into force, with the appropriate deadlines, and the exchange of data. Appendix II also contains a new text of major political importance, that is to say article X, relating to assistance and protection against chemical weapons. We need only recall that last year, in the same place, two texts confronted one another reflecting opposing conceptions, to be able to gauge the progress already accomplished in the search for solutions acceptable to all. I must also point out that on article XI, dealing with economic and technological development, consultations showed that there were no objections in principle, although for the moment it has not been possible to work on the text itself. Only one important aspect of the convention was not in fact dealt with directly this session - the order of destruction of stocks and production facilities - but for a good reason, since we can now count on the completion of the consultations conducted between the two States which have declared that they possess such stocks and facilities, that is to say the United States and the USSR.

(Mr. Morel, France)

I would also like to recall that the Committee established a technical group dealing with the instrumentation which will be necessary for the implementation of the future convention. This highly specialized group brought together experts from capitals, and will continue its work next year. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Rautio of Finland, who was kind enough to chair the group.

In accordance with long-standing practice, the Committee will hold open-ended consultations from 28 November to 14 December next with a view to holding a limited session from 16 January to 1 February 1990. Of course it will not be possible to take up all the topics which I have just spoken about. We will have to concentrate on current issues where specific results can be found for the new version of the "rolling text" which will be prepared for the 1990 session. The consultations which I have held with the group chairmen and with delegations lead me to propose the following subjects:

Group 1: The protocol on inspection procedures and the Group Chairman's working paper on article VI;

Group 2: Final clauses;

Group 3: The scientific advisory board;

Group 4: Guidelines for schedule 1 and machinery for revision of lists;

Group 5: Undiminished security during the destruction period.

I would add that I will be resuming the Chairman's consultations on the second part of article IX, that is to say challenge inspection.

In order to prepare for a sustained pace of work comparable to that maintained by the Committee throughout its session, it is my intention to conduct private bilateral consultations with all interested delegations during the week of 20 November. As has been the case since last February, the inter-sessional work will be conducted as teamwork with the five group chairmen, Mr. Rüdiger Lüdeking of the Federal Republic of Germany, Mr. Mohamed Gomaa of Egypt, Mr. Rakesh Sood of India, Mr. Johan Molander of Sweden and Dr. Walter Krutzsch of the German Democratic Republic. I would like to extend my warmest thanks to them for the decisive part they have played in the work on which I am reporting today. I would also like to extend my special thanks to the Secretary of the Ad hoc Committee, Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, his deputy, Ms. Agnès Marcaillou, and his assistant Ms. Cheryl Darby for their untiring and wholly exemplary assistance.

At the beginning of my statement I tried to suggest the perspective within which the work accomplished over the last six months should be assessed. But at the moment of concluding, I cannot but turn towards the future. My words will be simple and brief because the enthralling experience I have have lived through during this session has made this abundantly clear to me: let us constantly bear in mind that our time is not infinite, and that the Convention now being finalized will produce practical results only if it is universal in its application.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons for introducing the Committee's report, and for his warm remarks addressed to the Chair. I congratulate him on concluding the work of the Ad hoc Committee, which has considerably intensified its efforts under his chairmanship. I note that the Ad hoc Committee will continue its work before the next annual session of the Conference, and wish Ambassador Morel and the Ad hoc Committee every success in the forthcoming meetings of that subsidiary body. I now give the floor to the representative of China, Ambassador Fan.

Mr. FAN (China) (translated from Chinese): Forty months ago I came to Geneva for the fourth time to head the Chinese delegation to the Conference on Disarmament. Today, I wish to inform the Conference that the Chinese Government has appointed Ambassador Hou Zhitong to replace me as the new Ambassador in charge of disarmament affairs. Ambassador Hou will soon come to Geneva and, as a member of the Chinese delegation to the coming session of the United Nations General Assembly, he will have the opportunity to meet our colleagues in the First Committee.

Compared with the history of the Conference on Disarmamemnt, my tenure of office has been short. However, I am pleased to see that during these years great changes have taken place in the international situation, changes that mark a new trend of far-reaching significance. The highly confrontational situation where East and West faced each other with daggers drawn is easing. Confrontation is now giving way to dialogue. The conclusion of the INF Treaty by the United States and the USSR, and the various disarmament negotiations between the two major nuclear States and the two military blocs, have brought hope to people. However, people still feel worried because the arms race has never ceased and many negotiations have made little headway. The world is far from being a peaceful one. Hence there is still a long way to go and heavy responsibilities to shoulder in order to achieve disarmament for the purpose of safeguarding world peace and security and for economic development in all countries.

Many of my colleagues from different delegations have expressed such mixed feelings when talking about the work of the Conference. Disarmament affairs are no longer the monopoly of a few major military Powers. All countries, big or small, developed or developing, nuclear or non-nuclear, have the right to participate in work on disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament is composed of 40 member States with equal rights. These mechanisms which were established in line with the trends of the time made one feel eager to try for prompt results. It is disheartening to note, however, that this single multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament, as established by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, has made no progress on the agenda items concerning nuclear disarmament and outer space. Although some progress has been made in the intensive negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons, a breakthrough on key issues has yet to be made. The momentum of disarmament negotiations must be maintained and the multilateral negotiations on disarmament should by no means be weakened. How, then, can we resolve such a contradiction, which one might describe using the Chinese expression "much thunder but little rain"? It is in this context that many delegations have contributed various suggestions, including suggestions on how to continue the work of the Group of Seven.

(Mr. Fan, China)

Since 1987, when the Group of Seven was re-established to consider and make suggestions on the improvement and better functioning of the Conference on Disarmament, I have been honoured to chair the Group. The members of the Group in 1987 were Ambassador García Robles of Mexico, Ambassador Teja of India, Ambassador Nazarkin of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Meiszter of Hungary, Ambassador Beesley of Canada and Ambassador Butler of Australia. The non-aligned, socialist and Western groups each had two members who took part in the work of the Group in their individual capacities. After Ambassador Beesley's departure the Western group sent Ambassador van Schaik of the Netherlands to fill the post.

Although the seven of us did not formally represent the different groups, we were nevertheless recommended by the various parties and commissioned by the plenary to subject issues of common concern to positive and serious study. During the summer session in 1987 the Group met seven times and, on 24 July, submitted its first report as contained in document CD/WP.286, which presented the consensus view of the Group of Seven on two issues: subsidiary bodies and the annual report of the Conference to the General Assembly. Although some delegations expressed reservations on the report in the plenary, the view of the Group played a catalytic role in the actual drafting of the annual report to the United Nations General Assembly.

During the spring session in 1988 the Group of Seven held 10 meetings and submitted its second report on 12 April. We submitted our agreed proposals to the Conference on the participation of non-member States in the work of the Conference, the participation of scientific and technical experts in the work of the Conference and contacts between the Conference and non-governmental organizations. Yet we did not have enough time to reach conclusions on questions such as a consultative council on disarmament, the time, duration and organizaton of the annual sessions and the membership of the Conference. During the summer of 1988 the Conference held several informal plenary meetings at which many delegations expressed the wish that the Group of Seven should continue its work. Some delegations expressed reservations. All delegations agreed, however, that the work carried out by the Group during the previous two years had been useful, and made positive assessments of its work.

Consideration of the improvement and better functioning of the Conference can be carried out in various ways, of which the continuation of the activities of the Group of Seven is a useful one. The socialist group has proposed a list of topics for further discussion, and the Group of 21 has requested the Conference to renew the Group's mandate in 1990. The Chinese delegation appreciates the above-mentioned positive suggestions.

My participation in the work of the Group left me with the following impressions. In spite of the fact that each member had his own proposals and preferences, everyone adopted a positive attitude to discussions in order to seek common ground while setting aside differences, and to try to achieve concrete results. The Group does not serve as a means to exert pressure on any party, and there is no need to worry about that. Such questions as whether the members of the Group should act in their official or individual capacities, who should serve as its Chairman, what questions should be studied and what should be its mandate are subjects to be discussed. China is ready to participate in the work of the Group at any time.

(Mr. Fan, China)

At the moment of my departure I feel rather sad to part with colleagues with whom I have been working and co-operating for three years. We have already established and developed a fundamental relationship of co-operation here in Geneva and in New York, in and outside the conference rooms, in our official as well as personal capacities. It is gratifying to me, however, that I shall continue my co-operation with many colleagues in other fields of work in Geneva. Here I wish to express my gratitude to Ambassador Komatina, the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, and Ambassador Berasategui, the Deputy Secretary-General, for the valuable help and support which has been rendered to me. I should also like to thank all the staff members of the secretariat and the translators and interpreters, including of course the Chinese translators and interpreters, whose hard work is highly commendable.

Mr. President, during this important and busy month of August the Conference has scored remarkable results under your guidance. I offer my warm congratulations to you. May the Conference on Disarmament achieve new progress. I wish all my colleagues good health and further success.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of China for his statement and his wishes addressed to the Chair. We are all happy to know that Ambassador Fan is to continue his work in Geneva. We will certainly miss his friendship and his wise professional advice in the Conference. A diplomat of remarkable kindness and competence, Ambassador Fan occupied the Chair of the Conference during the opening month of the 1987 annual session, a period which is always difficult as it involves the organization of the Conference's work. He did so with authority and wisdom. His allusions to Chinese proverbs will stay in our memories as a source of good counsel.

In addition, he took on the responsible task of chairing the Group of Seven, in which he also demonstrated his professional qualities as an experienced diplomat. Moreover, he can be proud of the work he accomplished as representative of China in the Conference, to which he made a valuable contribution. I am sure that all the members of the Conference offer Ambassador Fan their best wishes for personal and professional success in his future tasks. I now give the floor to the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, Ambassador Bayart, to introduce the report of the Ad hoc Committee, contained in document CD/954.

Mr. BAYART (Mongolia) (translated from French): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate you on the occasion of your taking up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of August, a particularly difficult and busy period owing to the preparation and adoption of the Conference's annual report, and in that regard I would like to congratulate you doubly on the effective and skilful way in which you are discharging your heavy responsibilities. It is a pleasure for me to welcome the new representatives of Sri Lanka and Kenya and to assure them that my delegation will continue to co-operate with theirs. I learned with sadness of the forthcoming departure of the Ambassador of the Netherlands, Ambassador van Schaik, Ambassador Yamada of Japan and Ambassador Fan of China,

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

colleagues for whom I have great respect. Consequently, I wish them every success in their new duties in the future, and offer them my best wishes in their personal lives.

I now have the pleasure of presenting to the Conference on Disarmament the report of the Ad hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, which I have had the honour to chair during this 1989 session. The report, as you indicated a moment ago, appears in document CD/954. This report reflects in a concise manner the work carried out by the Ad hoc Committee during its 1989 session, and it was adopted in its entirety by the Committee at its 17th meeting on 24 August. During the current session the Committee has worked on the basis of the same mandate by which it has been governed, in principle, since the time of its establishment. As was agreed at the outset of the current session, the Committee allocated equal time to all three subjects covered by its mandate and the programme of work.

I believe that the discussions we have had during this session crystalized the positions of various countries still further and facilitated the search for ways and means to reach our ultimate goal - that of preventing an arms race in outer space. In this sense, the Ad hoc Committee made further progress in the implementation of its mandate. In my opinion, the discussions in the Committee were constructive, rich in substance, as well as in content, and added valuable new material to the already impressive amount of proposals and initiatives it had before it. I should like to point out that it was the opinion of many delegations that there exists a sound basis for activating a multilateral negotiating process aimed at the prevention of an arms race in outer space. They believe that step-by-step advancement towards comprehensive agreements through implementing a wide range of specific and mutually acceptable measures would promote greater confidence, thus opening up promising prospects. In this regard, a number of concepts of confidence-building measures were introduced in the Ad hoc Committee, such as the proposal to develop a multilateral code of conduct for States operating in outer space, and proposals on the use of space-based remote sensing techniques for monitoring compliance with international agreements. This year alone more than 10 working papers were submitted containing concrete proposals on ways of tackling various aspects of the problems related to the peaceful uses of outer space and the prevention of an arms race. I believe that this is evidence of a deep commitment and keen interest by member States in keeping the province of all mankind - outer space - free of arms of any kind. These proposals represent significant collective efforts by the Committee members, and I am confident that they will, in their own way, promote in-depth analysis of this highly complicated problem. The Committee gave preliminary consideration to a number of them.

Statements made both in plenary and in the Ad hoc Committee clearly demonstrate that delegations consider the problem of the prevention of an arms race in outer space as one of the priorities of the Conference on Disarmament. In this connection it should be noted that many delegations expressed their impatience and dissatisfaction at the fact that, after five years' consideration of this vital issue, no tangible result has been attained.

(Mr. Bayart, Mongolia)

The current session of the Committee was also highlighted by presentations by outer space experts from the USSR, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the German Democratic Republic and Canada. Many believed that the contributions from scientific and technical experts increased the Committee's technical knowledge, and continued to support the idea of the establishment of a group of governmental experts to provide technical expertise to assist in the consideration of the issues before the Ad hoc Committee. I am happy to report to the Conference the Ad hoc Committee's recognition of the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space, and its readiness to contribute to that common objective. It is recommended that the Conference on Disarmament should re-establish the Ad hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space with an adequate mandate at the beginning of the 1990 session.

The report I am presenting today is the fruit of lengthy and, at times, not very easy consultations. I am extremely grateful to all the members of the Committee for their spirit of compromise and flexibility, which enabled us to adopt the report almost on time and thus secured the continuity of the Ad hoc Committee's work. I would like to commend it to the Conference for approval. At the same time, I should like to express the hope, as did my predecessors, that next year the Committee will be able to commence more substantive work on the important issues before it. I have the feeling that more should and, indeed, could be done to prevent the arms race from spilling into outer space.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to the item co-ordinators of the various groups and China for their valuable support. I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to Mr. Valdimir Bogomolov, the Secretary of the Committee, to all other members of the secretariat staff, to the interpreters and those who assisted us directly or indirectly and provided us with all the necessary conditions for our work.

May I conclude this introduction on a personal note? This year I chaired the Ad hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space for the second time. It was indeed a very special honour and privilege for my country and for me personally.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee for introducing the Committee's report, and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. I would like to congratulate him on the conclusion of the work on an agenda item which is particularly important and delicate. I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea, Mr. Young Woo Park.

Mr. PARK (Republic of Korea): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to extend to you our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of August, and wish you every success in finalizing the work of the CD this year.

My delegation is pleased that the Republic of Korea has been invited again this year to participate as a non-member State in two subsidiary bodies of the Conference on Disarmament - the ad hoc committees on chemical weapons and on the comprehensive programme of disarmament - in addition to the plenary

(Mr. Park, Republic of Korea)

meetings. This extended participation in the work of the CD is a reflection of my Government's positive interest in the United Nations-sponsored multilateral disarmament negotiations. My delegation also wishes to express special thanks to Ambassador Miljan Komatina, Secretary-General of the CD, and his staff for their invaluable assistance in making the necessary arrangements and preprations.

Last year many encouraging developments took place. The INF Treaty signed by the United States and the Soviet Union came into force, and the long hostilities in the Gulf region came to a halt. In Asia and other regions there were positive signs of a resolution of multifaceted problems. Credit for these developments evidently was attributed to the increasing openness and the climate of co-operation in the international community. In this vein, the 24th Olympic Games held in Seoul last year was one of the significant global events, where a record 160 countries came together in an atmosphere of friendship, harmony and peace.

As the warm international climate continues this year and now stretches almost everywhere, the prospects for future development are perceived with renewed optimism. It is in this perspective that greater expectations are placed on the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, which completed their eleventh round in August this year. Another area for our interest is the negotiation on conventional armed forces in Europe, which is under way with heightened expectations. My delegation wishes to join others in sincerely hoping that the negotiations bring about productive results in such a way as to ensure the mutually desired equilibrium and stability.

The conference on the prohibition of chemical weapons in Paris in January of this year was a timely and most significant event. The Final Declaration adopted by consensus is a testimony to its success. The conference provided a valuable opportunity to reaffirm the validity of the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, signed on 17 June 1925 in Geneva, and to reaffirm the obligations established therein and commitments made thereto. The unequivocal support given to the United Nations and its Secretary-General underlines the world community's renewed awareness of their indispensable role in safeguarding mankind from the threat of this horrible weapon. It is a source of great satisfaction to my country that we participated in this global endeavour and were able to make constructive contributions to it. The accession to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 by my country represents a worthy addition to broadening the basis for a global chemical weapons ban.

While attending the Paris Conference, His Excellency Choi Ho-Joong, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, made clear in his address the stand my country takes with regard to chemical weapons. He said:

> "The Republic of Korea has never possessed and does not have at its disposal any type of chemical weapons. Nor will we consider developing, producing or stockpiling such weapons in the future. We categorically object to keeping chemical weapons on the Korean peninsula."

(Mr. Park, Republic of Korea)

He further proposed that South and North Korea should jointly renounce chemical weapons as a means of armed conflict with a view to freeing the whole Korean people, in both South and North, from the danger of such deadly weapons.

My delegation is impressed by the intensive efforts made under the able and dedicated leadership of Ambassador Pierre Morel of France to expedite negotiations on the chemical weapons convention. We wish to extend our deep appreciation to Ambassador Morel for the thoughtful arrangements he made for the participating non-member States of the CD to be informed of developments in the negotiations.

As understanding and co-operation by the civilian chemical industry is an integral part of an effective and verifiable chemical weapons convention, it is encouraging that the second part of the session saw the participation of representatives from the chemical industry. The Government-Industry Conference against Chemical Weapons to be held in Canberra in September this year is an important development in this endeavour. My delegation highly appreciates the invitation extended to my country by the Australian Government, and looks forward to participation in the conference. We hope that the momentum generated by the intensive efforts made and the other ensuing pertinent developments taking place this year will contribute positively to the speedy and early conclusion of the negotiations on the chemical weapons convention.

Under the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the dedication and hard work that have been demonstrated by the participating States in elaborating the programme merit our commendation. It is our sincere hope that Ambassador Alfonso García Robles will make a speedy recovery so that the work on the CPD may continue to benefit from his knowledge, experience and dedication. The programme itself, which encompasses a broad range of issues and contending approaches, is a reflection of world reality fraught with divergent interests and perceptions. The progress the Ad hoc Committee on the CPD makes in the course of engineering its task will, in my delegation's view, largely hinge upon the efforts devoted to closing the distance between the ideals envisaged and the realities faced.

Nuclear-weapon-free zones are a matter of our particular concern. It is not an easy task to make them universally applicable, because security situations differ from region to region. My delegation believes that such an approach is a matter for close consultation and co-operation among the parties concerned. We share the generally held view that the concurrence of the component members of a region, while taking due account of regional characteristics, is a prerequisite if the approach is to be considered tenable and viable.

Forthcoming in September this year is the third review conference of the sea-bed Treaty. We expect the fourth review conference of the NPT next year. The Republic of Korea, a party to the NPT since 1975, has faithfully complied with the provisions of the NPT and will continue to honour its commitments to non-proliferation. My delegation wishes to call upon those countries which have not acceded to the NPT to do so at an early date and accept the safeguard measures of the IAEA. We believe that the non-discriminatory application of

(Mr. Park, Republic of Korea)

safeguard measures to nuclear facilities of both weapon States and non-weapon States is also essential in enhancing the confidence of the international community in the NPT régime.

As for the third review conference of the sea-bed Treaty, the Preparatory Committee met in April to organize the work of the conference. And the informal meeting held last July was a worthy exercise to give consideration to such matters as the scope of application of the Treaty and effective means of verification taking into account relevant technological developments. We hope that in-depth discussion will take place on such matters in the forthcoming review conference in September.

In connection with the question of disarmament as it bears upon the Korean peninsula, my delegation notes with profound regret that despite recent international developments towards openness and reconciliation, the tension between the South and North of Korea remains high, and that there has been little success in diminishing the distrust and suspicion that exist between the two divided halves. The restoration of trust and confidence between the two sides is, therefore, a matter of top priority, as it has a vital bearing on the consolidation of security and peace on the Korean peninsula. It is for this reason that my Government has insisted time and again on promoting dialogue and exchanges between the two sides of Korea in order to build mutual trust and confidence, which are first and foremost a prerequisite for any meaningful disarmament negotiations.

The security arrangements my country has made with our ally are no different from military alliances in other parts of the world. Our security arrangements are most effective and time-proven, as they have been a realistic deterrent against a recurrence of hostilities in the Korean peninsula since the Korean war of 1950-1953, and instrumental in maintaining peace and stability in our region.

In conclusion, the steady and step-by-step approach with determined and concerted efforts is an earnest towards the realization of the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. My delegation sincerely hopes that the current mood of flexibility and co-operation will continue to be valuable assets conducive to making progress in the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of the Republic of Korea for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. I give the floor to the representative of Mexico, Mrs. Carvalho, who will introduce the report of the Ad hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, contained in document CD/955, on behalf of the Chairman of the Committee.

Mrs. CARVALHO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): First of all, Mr. President I would like to convey to you our warmest congratulations on the way in which you have conducted the work of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of August. At the same time I would like to place on record our appreciation for Ambassador Bayart's contribution as President of the Conference for the month of July.

(Mrs. Carvalho, Mexico)

On behalf of Ambassador García Robles, I wish to place before the Conference for its consideration the final report of the Ad hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, contained in document CD/955, which was adopted by the Committee at its meeting on 24 August. Despite the numerous meetings of the Committee and its contact groups and bilateral consultations little substantial progress was made during the 1988 session. This situation cannot be attributed to the lack of efforts on the part of the great majority of participating delegations, but rather to the position adopted by one or two delegations that year after year have hampered the course of negotiations. If those delegations are not prepared to shoulder their responsibilities, efforts will be futile, causing frustration and weariness to all.

Mankind continues to long for the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, however illusory some might think it, and it is for this reason that my country will remain, as it has been in the past, tireless in pursuing this objective and persistent in making its appeals heard to achieve this noble objective. Our delegation is confident that the positive trend in international relations will generate new ideas and cause positions to be reconsidered so that our efforts may be crowned with success. In such circumstances the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee recommends to the Conference on Disarmament a period of reflection before resuming its work in the near future, as is indicated in the conclusions of the report - in other words, when the great majority of members of the Conference consider that it is imperative to continue with our endeavours. Ambassador García Robles has asked me to express his very deep gratitude to the tireless co-ordinators of the working groups - Messrs. Finaud of France, Palihakkara of Sri Lanka, Grossi of Argentina, Sood of India, Mrs. Saif of Peru and Messrs. Karem of Egypt and Aas of Norway. Our thanks also go to all the staff of the secretariat, with a special mention for our Secretary, Mr. Gerardi, and his assistant Miss Gibson for their great competence in carrying out their functions.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of Mexico for introducing the report of the Ad hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament on behalf of the Chairman, and for her kind words addressed to the Chair. I would ask her to pass on to the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, Ambassador García Robles, our gratitude for his efforts in guiding the work of the Ad hoc Committee. I would also ask her to pass to him, on behalf of his colleagues in the Conference, our best wishes for a prompt recovery.

I have no other speakers on my list. Are there any delegations wishing to take the floor? Ambassador Friedersdorf of the United States, you have the floor, Sir.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): I would like to express our appreciation to the chemical weapons Ad hoc Committee Chairman Ambassador Pierre Morel and his five working group chairmen for the fine work accomplished this year. The report being submitted to the CD today reflects progress made this year in the many additions to the draft treaty text in appendix I and in the many useful papers in appendix II.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

The draft convention text in appendix I has been enhanced by the addition of two annexes - one on confidentiality and the other on chemicals; by new articles on ratification, accession and entry into force; and by new material on activities of the preparatory commission. Additionally, some issues in articles VIII and IX concerning the organization and procedures for clarifying concerns of States parties have been resolved.

Appendix II of our report reflects the results of many long and intensive discussions on very difficult, important issues that required a delicate balance of the security and political concerns of all countries participating in these negotiations. Discussions on the composition and function of the Executive Council have taken place for a number of years. This year, however, following intensive consultations, the Chairman has summarized, in appendix II text, various proposals for the Executive Council in order to help guide our future discussions on this subject. On the issue of challenge inspection, the Chairman made a truly commendable effort toward achieving consensus on the principle of mandatory, short-notice challenge inspection, however, delegations still do not fully agree. Difficulties remain over how to protect sensitive non-chemical-weapons military and civilian facilities while at the same time providing satisfaction with regard to compliance. The Chairman's work on challenge inspection in appendix II reflects both the progress and remaining difficulties and, along with the previous work on this subject, will serve as a good basis for further discussion.

We are deeply conscious of the need to eliminate chemical weapons from the face of the Earth as soon as possible. This is a matter of security for all countries. In the world today, security against chemical attack takes a variety of forms. During the 10-year period after the convention enters into force, a transition will take place from security based on that variety of forms to one based on the convention. A number of countries have raised concerns about how to ensure security during that period, while some chemical weapons, albeit a diminishing amount still exist in national arsenals. Many of the issues we have been discussing in the CD have dealt with security during the transition period from a variety of interrelated perspectives - the order of destruction, reservations, assistance and protection in the event of CW use, measures to deter non-compliance, and incentives to encourage all CW-capable States to join the convention. I believe we can and must find arrangements, consistent with the objectives of the convention, that will relieve the concerns of all States. In view of the complexity of the security factor, several different provisions may be necessary to resolve all the concerns.

It is the hope of the United States delegation that when our work resumes during the inter-sessional period and again in 1990, further attention will be given to these interrelated security issues and that ways will be found to address all concerns. Resolution of these issues is important in helping to achieve the necessary universality of the convention.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the representative of the United States for his statement.

(The President)

I should now like to report to you on the status of work on the Conference's draft annual report to the United Nations General Assembly. With today's presentation of the reports of the ad hoc committees under agenda items 4, 5 and 8, the work of the subsidiary bodies has been completed. I will put the three reports before the Conference for adoption at the final plenary meeting, which will be held next Thursday, before we take a decision on the annual report to the General Assembly. I invite the delegations which would like to speak on these three reports, either before or after their adoption, to place their names on the list of speakers. As I have already announced, at our last plenary meeting, there is one more issue to be settled, for which a solution must be found today or tomorrow. Since it is not possible to circulate a single document containing the draft annual report, I have asked the secretariat to make new arrangements for the presentation of the draft, which will be given its second reading in an informal meeting before the last plenary meeting. For the second reading of the technical parts and the substantive paragraphs on agenda items 1, 2, 3 and 7, we will have the following documentation: working paper CD/WP.370 on the technical parts, document CD/WP.370/Add.1 setting out additions and corrections made after the first reading of the technical parts, and also the second revisions of working papers CD/WP.371 to 374. You will recall that the English texts of these documents containing the substantive paragraphs were distributed in their first revised versions at the plenary meeting that was held last Thursday. The second revisions of the working papers will of course be circulated in all the official languages of the Conference.

The new documents - CD/WP.370/Add.1 and CD/WP.371-374/Rev.2 - will be distributed starting at 3 p.m. tomorrow in the delegations' pigeon-holes. The English versions will be available earlier, starting at 11 a.m., in order to give delegations time to study these texts before the second reading. As you know, the secretariat also has to prepare an index of the verbatim records by country and by subject for the 1989 annual session. I have been informed that the draft of the index will be circulated to delegations on Wednesday 6 September, and that the secretariat will accept delegations' corrections up to midday on 15 September, before the final text is incorporated in the annexes to the annual report.

Permit me now to outline to you the proposed programme we shall follow next Thursday. The informal meeting for the second reading of the draft annual report will be held from 11 a.m. Immediately afterwards, the Conference will hold a plenary meeting to adopt the reports of the ad hoc committees and then the annual report to the United Nations General Assembly. I would be grateful if delegations wishing to speak at Thursday's plenary meeting would give their names to the secretariat, indicating at the same time whether they wish to make their statements before or after the adoption of our annual report.

I have no other matters for consideration today. The Conference will hold an informal meeting at Thursday, 31 August at 11 a.m., and will hold its last plenary meeting for the year 1989 immediately after the informal meeting.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.